

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
MEDFORD DIVISION

LEONARD JACOB BOYD,
Plaintiff,

No. 1:12-cv-564-CL

v.

D. SCHMIDT, et al.,
Defendants.

ORDER

PANNER, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Mark D. Clarke filed a Report and Recommendation, and the matter is now before this court. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court makes a de novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Bus. Mach., Inc., 656 F. 2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981).

Here, plaintiff objects to the Report and Recommendation, so I have reviewed this matter de novo. I agree with Magistrate Judge Clarke that plaintiff failed to prosecute this action and failed to comply with a court order. Accordingly, I ADOPT the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Clarke.

CONCLUSION

Magistrate Judge Clarke's Report and Recommendation (#116) is adopted. Defendants' motions to dismiss for failure to prosecute (##88, 94), and for failure to comply with a court order (##100, 102) are granted. Defendants' motion to quash subpoena (#110) is granted, and plaintiff's motions for subpoena duces tecum (##104, 106, 112, and 114) are denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 1st day of May, 2014.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Owen M. Panner", written over a horizontal line.

OWEN M. PANNER
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE